

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 28-33 are added, claims 1, 11 and 14 are amended, and no claims are canceled (claims 4, 9, 18 and 22-24 were previously canceled). As a result, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-17, 19-21 and 25-33 are now pending in the application. Support for the claim amendments and newly added claims can be found throughout the disclosure, for example, at pages 3, 8-10 and 15-22 of the specification.

In the final Office Action of February 20, 2008, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-17 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,738,766 (Peng) further in view of U.S. Patent 7,000,015 (Moore) and yet further in view of U.S. Patent 6,976,063 (Dharmarajan). Claims 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Peng further in view of Moore and yet further in view of Dharmarajan and yet even further in view of U.S. Patent 6,581,075 (Guturu). These rejections are obviated in view of the amendments to the claims in this paper.

#### *Claim Amendments/New Claims*

Claim 1 is amended to recite “a first one of said default preference data records is associated with a first set of configuration preferences for said at least one device and a second one of said default preference data records is associated with a second set of configuration preferences for said at least one device.” Claim 11 and claim 14 are amended to recite similar features. This paper also adds dependent claim 28 stemming from claim 1 that recites, “wherein at least one of said three or more variables of the first one of said default preference data records

differs from a corresponding one of said three or more variables of the second one of said default preference data records resulting in the first set of configuration preferences being different than the second set of configuration preferences.” New dependent claim 29 recites “wherein the configuration preferences include one or more from a group consisting of a default homepage, access to data, restriction from accessing data, look and feel of an application, look and feel of a user interface, setting a key function, desktop organization, automatically disseminating information, scheduled device functions, and user interface settings for said at least one device.” New dependent claims are also added which stem from each of claims 11 and 14 and recite similar features to those of new claims 28-29. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest these features, as discussed below in the next section.

*35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections in view of Peng / Moore / Dharmarajan / Guturu*

The §103(a) rejections of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-17, 19-21 and 25-33 in view of various hypothetical combinations of Peng, Moore, Dharmarajan and Guturu are traversed for at least the following reasons.

The user preference variables of a computer system are useful for specifying various aspects of the computer’s look and feel, including aspects of the applications resident on the computer and the computer’s user interface. The present invention involves systems and methods for storing multiple sets of preferences for a computer system capable of being retrieved and implemented on the computer when specified variables are satisfied (e.g., a physical location variable and a user identification variable). To this end the claims recite such features as first and second “default preference data records ... associated with [first and second sets] of

configuration preferences for said at least one device”. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest these features.

The first cited patent, Peng, involves a system that tailors the search results of a data search to the capabilities of the device used to perform the data search. Peng recognizes the advantage of providing varying search results to different users based on the capability of their computing device. For example, wireless mobile devices have a limited amount of memory and inadequate processing capabilities for retrieving complex objects according to Peng. For such wireless devices the Peng system scales down the search results to more closely match the limited capabilities of wireless devices. This is what Peng means by providing personalized search results for wireless devices based on user profiles. Since Peng bases the search results on a particular device’s capabilities, Peng does not disclose or suggest two different sets of configuration preferences for any one device, and therefore does not teach or suggest the claimed features.

The second, third and fourth cited patents—Moore, Dharmarajan and Guturu—also fail to disclose or suggest two different sets of configuration preferences for a device. Moore involves a system for providing physical location information of a computing device based on the location of the device’s connection(s) to one or more networks. The Dharmarajan patent pertains to server computers used to host websites. Dharmarajan describes a system for dynamically configuring the server computers based on a global configuration file and a set of rules for the server to use in configuring itself. The Guturu patent concerns a method for maintaining synchronization among multiple databases.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest “a first one of said default preference data records is associated with a first set of configuration preferences for said at least one device and a second one of said default preference data records is associated with a second set of configuration preferences for said at least one device.” or the similar features recited in claims 11 and 14.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Peng, Moore, Dharmarajan, and Guturu, either taken singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


*Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition*

It is believed that no extension of time is required for this filing, and the accompanying Fee Transmittal attends to the required fees. However, to the extent necessary, a Provisional Petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571) 970-6835 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson  
Reg. No. 43,436

The Brevetto Law Group, PLLC  
107 S. West Street, #765  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
telephone: (571) 970-6835

**Date: March 13, 2008**